

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were presented for examination and were rejected. Applicant is hereby amending all fifteen claims. Support for all amendments is found in the application as originally filed. Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all claims herein, claims 1-15 as amended, are hereby respectfully requested.

In his second paragraph, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sana.

Applicant is hereby amending all of his claims to more particularly point out the novel features of his invention. As amended, Applicant's claims are patentably distinct over Sana for the following reasons:

With respect to claims 1, 7, and 12 (Applicant's three independent claims), Sana does not suggest the following features recited in these claims:

1. The use of a model computer as a test bed to generate the uninstall package.
2. The fact that the uninstall package is standalone, i.e., separate and distinct from the install package. In Sana, on the other hand, these packages are one and the same. Column 12, lines 28 and 29. Applicant's use of a separate standalone uninstall package saves time and network resources.

With respect to claims 2 and 8, Sana does not suggest interaction with a user in order to select which of a plurality of executable uninstall options are to be executed. The Examiner admits in his fourth paragraph that there is no user interaction with respect to de-installation.

With respect to claims 3, 9, and 14, Sana does not suggest the following features recited in these claims:

1. The use of a model computer.
2. The fact that a record of the software application's install-time activities is maintained.

With respect to claims 4, 10, and 15, Sana does not suggest an uninstall package having a minimum number of run-time components required for uninstallation of the software application, as recited in these claims.

With respect to claim 5, Sana does not suggest an uninstall package that is transmitted solely to selected ones of the computer terminals in the network.

With respect to claims 6 and 11, Sana does not suggest the following features recited in these claims:

1. Verifying that the uninstall package completely removed all files and registry entries associated with the software application.
2. Modifying the uninstall package when it did not completely remove all files and registry entries associated with the software application.

For the above-reasons, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claims 1-12, 14, and 15; and to allow these claims as amended.

In his fourth paragraph, the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sana in view of Lockbaum.

Applicant is hereby amending claim 13 to more clearly point out the subject matter of his invention. Amended claim 13 is patentable over the cited references for the following reasons:

Claim 13 recites interfacing with a user during generation of the uninstall package in order to select which of a plurality of executable uninstall options are to be executed at the time of deinstallation.

The Examiner admitted that Sana does not suggest any user interaction with respect to deinstallation. Nor does Lockbaum suggest the novel features recited in claim 13, for the following reasons:

1. Lockbaum does not suggest interaction with a user to select which of a plurality of executable uninstall options are to be executed. There are no options in Lockbaum. There is no interaction between the uninstall program and the user in Lockbaum.

2. Applicant's method is performed prior to deinstallation, i.e., at the time of generation of the uninstall package. On the other hand, Lockbaum's manual deinstallation is performed at the time of the deinstallation itself. Column 7, lines 37-38. This makes for a slower, more cumbersome deinstallation than in Applicant's invention.

For the above reasons, the Examiner is requested to withdraw his rejection of claim 13; and to allow this claim as amended.

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance of all claims herein, claims 1-15 as amended, and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees or believes that, for any other reason,

direct contact with Applicant's attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Edward J. Radlo".

Edward J. Radlo
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 26,793

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P. O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(415) 882-2402

cc: SYMPOL
IP/T Docketing CH